

<b>Notice of Allowability</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/784,711	NAKATSU, HARUHIKO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Kainoa BK Wright	2861	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--**

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to Amedment of 11/5/2006.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-4,9 and 10.
3. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some\*    c) ☐ None    of the:
    1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.

**THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.**

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
  5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS ( as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
    - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review ( PTO-948) attached
      - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
    - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                     |
| 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413),<br>Paper No./Mail Date _____ |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),<br>Paper No./Mail Date _____    | 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment                              |
| 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit<br>of Biological Material | 8. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance  |
|  | 9. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____   |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. The amendment filed 11/5/2006 is hereby acknowledged.

### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

2. Claims 1-4 & 9-10 are allowed.
3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding Claim 1: The claim is considered allowable based on the limitation that the functional relationship between the pulse count (i.e. the delay period  $d_2$  from h-sync detection to the start of image formation) of the first and second sides is  $d_2 = d_1 * F(x)$ ; whereas the prior art teaches a functional relationship of  $d_2 = d_1 + F(x)$ . The specifically claimed  $F(x)$  as equaling to  $1/(1+x/100)$  is interpreted to be an optimal value of  $F(x)$ , and optimization of a pre-established relationship is considered to be non-inventive and involves only routine skill in the art. It is examiners opinion that any representation of  $F(x)$  in multiplicative relationship to the delays is sufficient to suggest the claimed limitation. However, the relationship  $d_2 = d_1 * F(x)$  is distinguishable from the previous relationship of  $d_2 = d_1 + F(x)$  in that the relationship is multiplicative as opposed to additive, thus it allows for a greater degree of control over the second delay time (i.e. pulse count). This multiplicative relationship was not found in the prior art.

Regarding Claims 2-4: The claims are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Regarding Claim 9: Similarly to claim 1, claim 9 is considered allowable based on the limitation that the functional relationship between the pulse count (i.e. the delay period  $d_2$  from h-sync detection to the start of image formation) of the first and second sides is  $d_2 = d_1 * F(x)$ ; whereas the prior art teaches a functional relationship of  $d_2 = d_1 + F(x)$ . The specifically claimed  $F(x)$  as equaling to  $1/(1+x/100)$  is interpreted to be an optimal value of  $F(x)$ , and optimization of a pre-established relationship is considered to be non-inventive and involves only routine skill in the art. It is examiners opinion that any representation of  $F(x)$  in multiplicative relationship to the delays is sufficient to suggest the claimed limitation. However, the relationship  $d_2 = d_1 * F(x)$  is distinguishable from the previous relationship of  $d_2 = d_1 + F(x)$  in that the relationship is multiplicative as opposed to additive, thus it allows for a greater degree of control over the second delay time (i.e. pulse count). This multiplicative relationship was not found in the prior art.

Regarding Claim 10: The claim is allowable as depending from an allowable base claim.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kainoa BK Wright whose telephone number is (571) 272-5102. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am - 5:30pm.

Art Unit: 2861

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthw Luu can be reached on (571) 272-7663. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, stylized 'K' followed by a horizontal line that tapers off to the right.

KAI  
2/27/07

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'HAI PHAM' in a cursive style.

HAI PHAM  
PRIMARY EXAMINER